Research& Planning

LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY
WITHDRAWN

CONCERNS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF

CONDOMINIUM RESIDENTS

Alberta
CONSUMER AND
CORPORATE AFFAIRS

104-03924/

CONCERNS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF CONDOMINIUM RESIDENTS

Research Review Paper No. 20

Alberta Consumer and Corporate Affairs
Research and Planning
October 31, 1983

NOTE: THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN PREPARED FOR STUDY AND DISCUSSION PURPOSES BY THE RESEARCH SECTION AND DOES NOT REPRESENT DEPARTMENT POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1

2. Condominium Problems 3

3. Who Lives in Condominiums? 4

4. What Future do Residents see for Condominiums? 5

5. Summary and Conclusions 6

Appendices

1. Survey Method 10

2. Physical Condition of Surveyed Structures . . 16

3. Tabulated Findings 17

CONCERNS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF CONDOMINIUM RESIDENTS

1. Introduction

Until the late 1960's, single family homes and an assortment of rental accommodation dominated the housing market. But rising costs of land and construction provoked a shift toward more clustered dwellings, first evident as town houses and highrises for rental, then as the more innovative condominium form of residence.

The condominium, through high-density design and sharing of common space and facilities, not only gave people access to the savings associated with these frugal construction techniques, but enabled them to own, not rent, their homes.

Still experimental, condominium structures are finding their own level in a cautious housing market. Some developments have brought their occupants unexpected delights; others have caused considerable hardship; and still others, the great majority, have proven entirely satisfactory and are offering a welcome alternative to costly single homes.

Passage of The Condominium Properties Act[1] ushered in Alberta's first condominiums in 1968-69. By May, 1975, builders

---

[1] Alberta, Revised Statutes 1970, c 62, 1966.

had registered 4,659 condominium plans in Alberta -- 3,052 in Edmonton and 1,607 in Calgary -- and in the last two years have sought building permits for about 6,000 more units. In less than ten years, condominium residences have grown to more than 10,000, and today comprise 2½% of all owned housing in Alberta.

This paper reports the findings of a survey of 603 condominium owners in Edmonton and Calgary. Conducted in the spring of 1975, the poll helps identify: what guidelines for construction, marketing, and consumer advice might be considered in this field; who should benefit from such standards; and how permanent -- and therefore how deserving of attention -- condominiums seem to be in the market for housing.

To shed light on these areas, the survey focused on three broad questions:

1. What problems do residents encounter with their accommodation?
2. Who buys condominiums?
3. Why did buyers choose condominiums and how lasting did they consider their decisions to be.

The answers to these questions could offer assistance to legislators faced with the responsibility of drafting a new condominium act, provide guidance for the construction and operation of condominiums, and help to measure the need for education and public information directed toward residents or potential buyers of condominiums.

2. Condominium Problems

One third of all residents recalled problems they thought worthy of mention. Faulty maintenance of shared space and facilities was the main concern, noted by almost one in five respondents. Such deficiencies in repair and cleanliness reflect on caretaking staff, condominium boards, and management firms, although owners voiced few explicit complaints about the administration of their buildings.

The activities of children annoyed 3.4% of residents, second in importance to concerns about maintenance. Undoubtedly, youngsters could feel their freedom impeded in a condominium, especially in a highrise structure, and mischievous behaviour could become destructive. The frustration that confinement brings can certainly aggravate problems of faulty upkeep, noise, and of clutter, grievances which were more frequent in town house developments where children were common.

Difficulties were more prevalent in newer condominiums. With the liklihood of inexperienced board members, inevitable disputes with developers, and the sorting-out of flaws common to new structures, almost half the residents in condominiums less than two years old cited problems. In older buildings, only a quarter of the owners voiced problems.

Asked to rate thier overall satisfaction with condominium living, almost three quarters of residents judged it "satisfactory" or "very satisfactory". The main cause of concern was the physical condition of buildings, while such matters as board performance or

the adequacy of information given before purchase caused few worries. Highrise residents were generally more satisfied with their choice than were owners of town house and, for no clear reason, Calgary revealed more satisfied condominium homeowners than did Edmonton.

Tables 12, 14, and 19 through 22 in Appendix 3 present kinds of problems and degrees of satisfaction among condominium dwellers in Edmonton and Calgary.

3. Who Lives in Condominiums?

Condominium owners come from many walks of life and from diverse social and educational backgrounds. More than a third of all employed residents were in the professional or managerial fields, and a further one third were in trades or service occupations.

Retired people were five times as numerous in highrise developments as in row condominiums, probably reflecting a preference for minimal home maintenance and leisure-time facilities. People working in trades and services, however, were more evident in town houses; individuals in these occupations comprised one third of town house residents. The presence of white-collar workers varied little between the two types of condominium.

Three-quarters of all residents were under 40 years of age, with highrise residents relatively older and town house owners relatively younger. Overall, occupants of highrise condominiums were twelve to thirteen years older than people living in row developments.

There were children in almost two-thirds of the households contacted, and the vast majority of these were in row condominiums; younger couples are more likely to have their children still living at home, and row housing is usually better adapted than a highrise complex to the needs of youngsters.

Before buying their condominiums, residents occupied many sorts of accommodation, owned and rented. Seventy percent had been tenants, largely in town houses or suites and, to a far lesser extent, in detached houses. Thirty percent had owned their previous accommodation, mainly detached houses; a few had, in fact, owned condominiums.

The majority of row house owners had lived in rented premises before selecting their condominiums. Conversely, most residents in highrise condominiums had been property owners.

4. What Future do Residents See For Condominiums?

Two of every three town house residents bought their condominiums to avoid rent and to build equity; they did not expressly seek the life style as an end in itself. On the other hand, only 42% of highrise residents voiced these same objectives. The rest chose condominium living to shed the burden of home maintenance and to enjoy the amenities and social life.

In any highrise development, more retired individuals and people who had owned previous homes could be expected in a row condominium of similar size, suggesting a long-term commitment to this

kind of residence. The predominance of new families in row housing suggests the condominiums were sought after partly as first homes, regarded as a step toward something better. Overall, however, more than one-half of people interviewed had no plans to move within the next five years.

According to these findings, condominiums could well be a lasting feature of the home market -- highrises for those who have had their own house and now prefer a more carefree lifestyle, recreational amenities, and an urban location, and town houses for younger families unwilling to be tenants.

5. Summary and Conclusions

With the lure of a very different way of life, highrise condominiums have attracted middle-to-high income individuals, many of them retired, away from their own homes, and from the chores of yard and house maintenance. In these structures can be found few children, relatively older residents, and generally high satisfaction among owners with their chosen accommodation.

The appeal of the town house condominium, on the other hand, has been the opportunity to accumulate equity rather than rental receipts, an attraction most felt by young and growing families of modest means. With their predominance of children, some of these complexes are in need of more maintenance than is available, and are considered marginally less satisfactory by their occupants.

According to survey findings, condominiums appear to be an essential part of the housing market. In other jurisdictions, particularly in Ontario, condominium ownership is widespread; in time it probably will reach this level of acceptance in Alberta, provided structures are well-built and satisfy consumer expectations. Because condominiums are meeting several distinct and lasting needs, it is important that the advantages this form of residence offers are not eroded by careless development or poor management.

The opinions of residents revealed certain problems in construction, marketing, and consumer advice, and suggested some broad guidelines in these areas. Condominium boards would benefit from counsel on hiring caretaking staff, letting management contracts, and drafting and enforcing bylaws pertaining to building conditions and maintenance. As well, both row and highrise developments could be designed more with children in mind; this matter might be taken up with developers and their views on its practicality solicited.

Given current trends in building design, families with children who feel they would prefer a highrise condominium, should remember, as demonstrated in the survey, that youngsters may feel at odds with the highrise environment.

Because most of the complaints about highrise developments were voiced by residents in very new buildings, there is a potential need for additional consumer advice before and immediately after purchase. Such information might prepare individuals

to expect and enable them to cope with those problems peculiar to new and untested structures.

Consumer advice and legislative reform in the condominium field would benefit a variety of individuals. Those in the professional and managerial areas, trades, and services, occupy two-thirds of all condominiums and would be a distinct interest group. People retired or planning retirement also should be receptive to information concerning the selection of a condominium unit, particularly in a highrise building. With lesser satisfaction registered by row condominium owners, some attention to their specific problems would be in order. At the same time, structural and mechanical difficulties are more probable in highrises and would suggest that advice be extended to potential buyers and new residents of these condominiums.

From a government viewpoint, a program of public bulletins explaining the condominium concept, of a manual on guidelines to condominium management, and of supplementary extension courses in this area, would be a wise first step toward preserving the attraction of condominium ownership and keeping home-seekers generally informed of their options in the housing market. Such a program would also complement any legislative moves.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

SURVEY METHOD

Condominium residents in Edmonton chosen for interviews were selected by a two-stage sampling procedure. Developments were randomly chose to include approximately one-half of all units in Edmonton, excluding those less than three month old. Interviews were conduced at every third unit.

An equivalent plan was intended for Calgary, however several developments had been placed entirely on the rental market. Accordingly, the sample was revised to include all other condominiums older than three months and, again, every third unit was visited. The surveyed complexes are listed at the end of Appendix 1.

To obtain a comprehensive view of problems, particularly in the management of buildings, condominium board members as well as other residents were sampled.

Four field workers conducted the survey. The three in Edmonton held 443 face-to-face interviews, while 160 interviews were completed by the single worker in Calgary.

Four sections comprised the interview questionnaire. The first recorded details of each building such as location, history, and physical characteristics. The second listed questions respecting residents' characteristics, problems, and plans. The third section was designed for board members only, and the fourth

provided space for comments by the interviewer. A copy of the questionnaire is presented below.

CONDOMINIUM RESIDENT SURVEY
QUESTIONNAIRE

A. The Development

1. Name _____

2. Location _____

3. Type: Row _____ Stack _____

4. Age of the structure _____

5. How long as a condominum _____

6. General physical condition, including appearance:

POOR FAIR GOOD EXCELLENT

B. Resident Characteristics:

7. Occupations: Respondent _____

Spouse _____

8. Ages: Respondent _____

Spouse _____

9. Are there any children less than teen-age?

Yes _____ No _____

10. How long have you resided here:

(Nearest Year) _____

11. Do you own or rent?

Own _____ Rent _____

12. What type of accomodation did you have before?

Suite, rented _____ Row, rented _____

Suite, owned _____ Detached, rented _____

Row, rented _____ Detached, owned _____

*(Note to interviewer: Detached includes 2 & 4 plexes)

13. Do you plan to stay here?

Yes _____ No _____

a. If YES, how long? _____

b. Record Comments:

14. What prompted you to purchase a condominium?
(Record open response)

15. What prompted you to purchase this condominium?
(Record open response)

16. Even though you purchased for the above reasons, do you feel that this type of accomodation is the most suitable for you and your family?

Yes _____ No _____

a. If NO, what type do you feel is most suitable?

Own House _____

Apartment _____

Other (Specify) _____

17. Were the following conditions made explicit at the time of purchase?

	Yes	No
a. Management fee	_____	_____
b. Peripheral costs (e.g. insurance, parking, garbage)	_____	_____

18. What problems have you encountered with this accomodation?
(Open Response - probe for rank)

19. How fairly and effectively does the board deal with resident's problems?

Not at all _____ Poorly _____

Adequately _____ Very Well _____

20. In general, how satisfied are you with your accomodation?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all				Very much

C. Board Members Only:

Items 21 - 23 open response

21. What is the purpose of your board?

22. How are board members chose?

23. How often do you meet?

24. Can the board deal effectively with the resident's problems?

Not at all _____ Poorly _____

Adequately _____ Very Well _____

D. Interviewer's Comments:

COMPLEXES SURVEYED

I. Edmonton

A. Highrise and walk-up

1. Jamieson
2. Quinn House
3. Elm Park
4. Wedgewood Village
5. The Dutchess
6. Hyde Park

B. Row and Town house

1. Grandin Village I (St. Albert)
2. Primrose Gardens
3. Woodstock
4. Great Oaks I & II (Sherwood Park)
5. Norshire Gardens
6. Village on the Green
7. Ridgewood Terrace

II. Calgary

A. Highrise and walk-up

1. Marlene Apartments
2. Shorecrest Manor

B. Row and Town house

1. Willow Tree Village
2. Kelvin Grove
3. Riverbend Village
4. Oak Lampton Court
5. Ruthland News
6. 4401 Bow Trail S.W.
7. Braeside Village

APPENDIX 2

PHYSICAL CONDITION OF SURVEYED STRUCTURES

Mainly, the complexes surveyed were row or town house developments situated in newly opened suburbs. Highrise or walk-up condominiums comprised less than 15% of the entire sample and most were located close to city centres.

The apparent physical condition of the buildings varied widely, with the majority kept in good to excellent condition. One large row house structure in Edmonton had been allowed to deteriorate much more than most.

Three-quarters of the units surveyed were in buildings more than four years old, but only 62% had been condominiums for more than four years. This discrepancy is due to a spurt of condominium conversions in 1974 and 1975; more than 30% of the units examined in Calgary had been converted from rental. Condominiums less than two years old were far more numerous than those two-four years old, an indication of the increasing interest in condominiums among developers.

APPENDIX 3

TABULATED FINDINGS

TABLE 1

CHARACTERISTICS OF CONDOMINIUM STRUCTURES, BY CITY

Characteristic		(% of Total Units Within Each Characteristic)		
		Calgary	Edmonton	Both Cities
Location:	Within one mile of city centre	16.3	8.1	10.8
	Outside one-mile radius	83.7	91.9	89.2
Type:	Row units	91.3	83.9	85.3
	Highrise/walk-up	8.7	16.1	14.1
Age of Building:	Less than 2 years	23.8	10.8	14.3
	2 - 4 years	3.1	12.3	9.8
	More than 4 years	73.1	76.9	75.9
Age as Condominium:	Less than 2 years	60.6	17.0	28.6
	2 - 4 years	0.0	12.3	9.0
	More than 4 years	39.4	70.7	62.4
Physical Condition:	Poor	6.9	24.8	20.0
	Fair	28.1	17.8	20.5
	Good	43.7	41.3	41.9
	Excellent	21.3	16.0	17.4

TABLE 2

OCCUPATIONS OF RESPONDENTS AND SPOUSES BY CITY

Occupation	Calgary		Edmonton		Both Cities	
	Respondent (% of total)	Spouse	Respondent (% of total)	Spouse	Respondent (% of total)	Spouse
Housewife	40.0	22.5	56.9	8.1	52.4	11.9
Managerial	9.4	13.8	5.0	14.9	6.2	14.6
Professional	16.9	6.9	8.9	13.3	11.0	11.5
Sales/clerical	9.4	13.1	7.7	8.9	8.1	10.0
Labourer	1.9	3.1	2.9	5.9	2.6	5.1
Trades	11.3	11.2	7.3	23.1	8.3	19.9
Services	3.8	5.6	3.9	8.9	3.9	8.0
Retired	3.8	1.2	3.9	2.6	3.9	2.2
Unemployed	3.1	1.9	3.2	1.8	3.1	1.8
No response	0.6	20.6	0.2	12.5	0.3	14.7
Total	100.2	99.9	99.9	100.0	99.8	99.7

TABLE 3

AGES OF RESPONDENTS AND SPOUSES, BY CITY

Age	Calgary		Edmonton		Both Cities	
	Respondent (% of total)	Spouse (% of total)	Respondent (% of total)	Spouse (% of total)	Respondent (% of total)	Spouse (% of total)
Under 21	2.5	1.3	2.3	1.8	2.4	1.6
21 - 30	40.6	34.4	44.9	32.4	43.8	32.9
31 - 40	29.4	25.0	28.7	33.6	28.9	31.3
41 - 50	11.9	7.5	13.3	9.9	12.9	9.2
51 - 65	11.9	10.6	5.9	6.8	7.5	7.8
Over 65	1.9	1.3	4.6	3.2	3.9	2.6
No Response	1.9	20.1	0.2	12.2	0.7	14.4
Total	100.1	100.2	99.9	99.9	100.1	99.8

TABLE 4

FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN, BY CITY

	Calgary	Edmonton	Both Cities
Children	56.9	68.6	65.4
No children	42.5	31.2	34.2
No response	0.6	0.2	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0	99.9

TABLE 5

TENURE, BY CITY

Tenure	Calgary (% of total)	Edmonton (% of total)	Both Cities (% of total)
Own	91.3	82.9	85.2
Rent	6.9	16.7	14.0
No Response	1.9	0.5	0.9
Total	100.1	100.1	100.1

TABLE 6

PREVIOUS ACCOMMODATION, BY CITY

Type and Tenure of Accommodation	Calgary (% of total)	Edmonton (% of total)	Both Cities (% of total)
Suite: Rented	41.3	43.3	42.8
Owned	5.6	1.6	2.7
Row: Rented	20.0	6.4	10.1
Owned	0.0	3.6	2.6
Detached and semi-detached: Rented	3.8	21.6	16.8
Owned	27.5	22.5	23.9
No Response	1.9	0.9	1.2
Total	100.1	99.9	100.1

TABLE 7

LENGTH OF RESIDENCE IN CONDOMINIUMS, BY CITY

Years of Residence	Calgary (% of total)	Edmonton (% of total)	Both Cities (% of total)
Less than 1	66.3	46.6	51.9
1 - 2	11.9	20.0	17.8
2 - 3	6.3	11.8	10.3
3 - 4	6.3	11.4	10.0
4 - 6	7.5	9.8	9.2
No Response	1.9	0.5	0.9
Total	100.2	100.1	100.1

TABLE 8

EXPECTED DURATION OF TENURE, BY CITY

Expected Duration of Tenure	Calgary (% of total)	Edmonton (% of total)	Both Cities (% of total)
Move planned shortly	18.8	27.4	25.1
Transfer anticipated	4.8	4.0	4.2
Less than 2 years	5.4	11.4	9.8
2 - 5 years	6.1	4.2	4.7
5 plus or indefinite	61.0	52.1	54.5
No response	3.8	0.7	1.5
Total	99.9	99.8	99.8

TABLE 9

GENERAL AND SPECIFIC PURCHASE REASONS, BY CITY

		Calgary (% of total)	Edmonton (% of total)	Both Cities (% of total)
General[1] Reasons:	Get equity/no rent	53.8	59.5	58.0
	Less care than house	24.4	12.1	15.4
	Lifestyle	10.0	9.8	9.9
	Other	8.8	12.3	11.4
	No response	3.1	6.4	5.5
	Total	100.1	100.1	100.2
Specific[2] Reasons:	Location	26.9	25.3	25.8
	Cost	16.3	17.4	16.9
	Only one available	15.0	14.9	14.9
	Facilities and features	33.8	24.7	27.2
	Other	5.6	15.9	13.1
	No Response	2.5	2.1	2.2
	Total	100.1	100.3	100.1

(1) General reasons are purchasers reasons for choosing condominiums over other forms of tenure.

(2) Specific reasons are purchasers' reasons for choosing the particular complex they bought.

TABLE 10

PREFERRED ACCOMMODATION, BY CITY

Accommodation Preference	Calgary (% of total)	Edmonton (% of total)	Both Cities (% of total)
Present accommodation most suitable	71.0	62.8	65.0
Prefer single-family dwelling	23.6	32.8	30.4
Prefer apartment	3.5	2.1	2.5
Other preferences	0.6	1.8	1.5
No Response	1.3	0.5	0.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.1

TABLE 11

INFORMATION GIVEN AT TIME OF SALE, BY CITY

	Calgary (% of total)	Edmonton (% of total)	Both Cities (% of total)
Condominium Fees:			
Full information given	83.8	67.9	72.2
Full information not given	8.8	15.8	14.0
No response	7.5	16.2	13.9
Total	100.1	99.9	100.1
Other costs/responsibilities:			
Full information given	79.4	53.9	60.8
Full information not given	11.3	17.2	15.6
No response	9.4	28.9	23.7
Total	100.1	100.0	100.1

TABLE 12

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY RESIDENTS, BY CITY

Problems	Calgary (% of total)	Edmonton (% of total)	Both Cities (% of total)
None	56.9	67.3	64.5
Pets	0.0	2.5	1.8
Children	1.3	4.3	3.4
Maintenance	25.6	15.1	18.0
Other	15.0	9.5	11.0
No response	1.3	1.4	1.3
Total	100.1	100.1	100.0

TABLE 13

ADEQUACY OF BOARDS IN DEALING WITH PROBLEMS, BY CITY
(NON-BOARD MEMBERS ONLY)

Adequacy of Boards	Calgary (% of total)	Edmonton (% of total)	Both Cities (% of total)	Both Cities (Non-response excluded)
None	3.8	5.7	5.2	8.6
Poor	8.1	6.8	7.2	11.9
Adequate	26.9	38.7	35.5	58.7
Very good	23.1	8.8	12.6	20.8
No response/ do not know	38.1	40.1	39.5	N/A
Total	100.1	100.1	100.1	

TABLE 14

RESIDENTS' SATISFACTION WITH CONDOMINIUMS, BY CITY

Level of Satisfaction	Calgary (% of total)	Edmonton (% of total)	Both Cities (% of total)
Very dissatisfied	0.6	3.8	3.0
Dissatisfied	3.8	2.5	2.8
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	25.0	19.1	20.7
Satisfied	26.3	39.5	35.9
Very satisfied	42.5	33.9	36.2
No response	1.9	1.4	1.5
Total	100.1	100.2	100.1

TABLE 15

RESPONSES BY BOARD MEMBERS REGARDING FUNCTIONING OF BOARDS, BY CITY

	Calgary (% of total)	Edmonton (% of total)
Purpose of the Board:		
As defined by the Act	90.3	98.0
Other responses	9.7	1.9
Method of choosing members:		
As required by the Act	100.0	97.9
Other responses	0.0	2.1
Frequency of meetings:		
At least monthly	80.6	76.3
Every two months	0.0	2.6
Every four to six months	6.5	5.3
Twice yearly	0.0	10.5
Once yearly	0.0	2.6
As necessary	9.7	2.6
Board effectiveness:		
None	0.0	2.2
Poor	12.9	0.0
Adequate	61.3	73.9
Very Good	25.8	23.9

TABLE 16

PREVIOUS ACCOMMODATION, BY AGE GROUP[1]

Age Group \ Previous Accommodation	Rented Accommodation				Owned Accommodation				Total
	Suites	Row Houses	Houses	Total Rented	Suites	Row Houses	Houses	Total Owned	
Less than 21	61.5	7.7	7.7	76.9	0	7.7	15.4	23.1	100.0
21 - 30	55.0	11.6	14.7	81.3	2.0	2.0	11.2	18.8	100.1
31 - 40	40.7	10.0	22.0	72.7	5.3	5.3	20.0	27.3	100.0
41 - 50	24.0	4.0	25.3	53.3	4.0	4.0	40.0	46.7	100.0
51 - 65	27.0	0	13.5	40.5	0	0	59.5	59.5	100.0
Over 65	19.0	9.5	0	28.5	0	0	71.4	71.4	99.9

(1) Tables 16 through 30 contain crosstabulations of variables tabulated in Tables 1 through 15. Due to space considerations, crosstabulations are presented only for those variables exhibiting dependence on each other.

TABLE 17

GENERAL PURCHASE REASONS, BY AGE GROUP

Age Group \ General Purchase Reason	Equity/ Avoidance of Rent	Less Care	Lifestyle	Other	Total
Less than 21	40.0	30.0	0	30.0	100.0
21 - 30	75.5	6.1	9.4	9.0	100.0
31 - 40	65.5	13.5	12.8	12.8	99.9
41 - 50	48.6	20.8	13.9	13.9	100.0
51 - 65	36.8	31.6	21.1	21.1	100.0
Over 65	30.0	50.0	10.0	10.0	100.0

TABLE 18

SPECIFIC PURCHASE REASONS, BY AGE GROUP

Age Group \ Specific Purchase Reason	Location	Cost	Only one Available	Facilities and Features	Other	Total
Less than 21	30.8	7.7	7.7	7.7	46.2	100.1
21 - 30	26.0	24.4	13.6	23.2	12.8	100.0
31 - 40	29.7	29.7	18.2	8.1	8.1	99.9
41 - 50	32.4	32.4	17.6	20.3	20.3	100.1
51 - 65	21.1	21.1	10.5	15.8	15.8	100.1
Over 65	31.8	31.8	22.7	27.3	27.3	99.9

TABLE 19

PROBLEMS, BY CONDITION OF BUILDING

Problem / Condition of Building	None	Maintenance	Children	Pets	Other	Total
Poor	51.4	24.8	7.6	3.8	12.4	100.0
Fair	64.7	21.6	3.3	0.7	9.8	100.1
Good	64.3	17.4	1.4	2.3	14.6	100.0
Excellent	82.7	9.9	1.2	1.2	4.9	99.9

TABLE 20

PROBLEMS, BY PRESENCE OF CHILDREN

Problems / Presence of children	None	Maintenance	Children	Pets	Other	Total
Children in household	64.0	20.3	4.0	2.6	9.1	100.0
No children in household	71.9	15.1	1.6	1.0	10.4	100.0

TABLE 21

PROBLEMS, BY AGE OF CONDOMINIUM

Age of Condominium \ Problems	None	Maintenance	Children	Pets	Other	Total
Less than two years	52.7	24.3	0.6	1.2	21.3	100.1
2 - 4 years	78.0	18.0	0	0	4.0	100.0
More than four years	71.7	15.2	2.1	2.1	7.1	100.1

TABLE 22

PROBLEMS, BY PLANS TO MOVE

Plans \ Problems	None	Maintenance	Children	Pets	Other	Total
Plans to move	56.6	21.0	8.4	2.8	11.2	100.0
Plans to stay	68.9	17.4	1.2	1.7	10.7	99.9

TABLE 23

PLANS TO MOVE, BY CONDITION OF BUILDING

Condition of Building \ Plans	Plans to Move	Plans to Stay	Total
Poor	38.9	61.1	100.0
Fair	20.5	79.5	100.0
Good	25.1	74.9	100.0
Excellent	18.6	81.4	100.0

TABLE 24

AGE OF RESIDENTS, BY TYPE OF CONDOMINIUM SELECTED

Type \ Age Group	Less than 21	21-30	31-40	41-50	51-65	Over 65	Total	Median Age
Highrise/walk-up	3.5	21.5	18.1	22.2	21.5	13.2	100.0	44.1
Town house	2.6	45.1	32.9	11.6	5.7	2.2	100.0	31.6

TABLE 25

PRESENCE OF CHILDREN, BY TYPE
OF CONDOMINIUM SELECTED

Type	Children in Household	No children in Household	Total
Highrise/walk-up	26.0	74.0	100.0
Town house	70.4	29.6	100.0

TABLE 26

PREVIOUS ACCOMMODATION, BY TYPE
OF CONDOMINIUM SELECTED

Type	Suites	Row Houses	Houses	Total Rented	Suites	Row Houses	Houses	Total Owned	Total, Owned and Rented
Highrise/walk-up	45.3	2.7	9.3	57.3	0	0	42.7	42.7	100.0
Town house	43.8	10.4	19.4	73.6	2.9	3.1	20.4	26.4	100.0

TABLE 27

GENERAL PURCHASE REASONS, BY TYPE OF CONDOMINIUM SELECTED

General Purchase Reason / Type	Equity Avoidance of Rent	Less Care Than House	Lifestyle	Other	Total
Highrise/walk-up	42.3	22.5	15.5	19.7	100.0
Town house	66.0	14.0	8.9	11.1	100.0

TABLE 28

PROBLEMS, BY TYPE OF CONDOMINIUM SELECTED

Type \ Problem	None	Maintenance	Children	Pets	Other	Total
Highrise/walk-up	67.4	17.7	2.9	1.9	10.1	100.0
Town house	57.9	18.4	2.6	3.9	17.1	99.9

TABLE 29

LEVEL OF SATISFACTION, BY TYPE OF CONDOMINIUM SELECTED

Type \ Level	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Neutral	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Total
Highrise/walk-up	5.3	1.3	21.1	26.3	6.1	100.1
Town house	3.0	3.8	21.3	38.8	33.1	100.0

TABLE 30

RESIDENTS' OCCUPATIONS, BY TYPE OF CONDOMINIUM SELECTED (EXCLUDING HOUSEWIVES)

Type \ Occupation	Managerial	Professional	Sales/clerical	Labour	Trades	Services	Retired	Unemployed	Total
Highrise/walk-up	15.8	18.8	12.9	4.0	17.8	5.9	16.8	7.9	99.9
Town house	17.1	16.8	16.4	6.0	25.8	11.3	3.4	3.5	100.3